

*Appln No. 10/760,240
Amdt. Dated February 3, 2006
Response to Office Action of December 14, 2005

10

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Final Office Action dated December 14, 2005.

Reconsideration of this application is requested. In this response, claim 1 has been amended. Consequently, claim 1 is under consideration.

I Claim Objections

To overcome the Examiner's objection to claim 1 the amendments have been prepared to this claim to amend the word "slot" to "slit".

II Claim rejections 35 USC § 103

With regard to the obviousness objection under 35 USC § 103 (a) to claim 1 based on Martin in view Fujii et al (US Patent No. 6715423) and Kwasy (US Patent Application No. 2002/0118990) we set out the following.

Kwasy et al discloses slitting of a web in order to help ensure minimal paper loss. The slitting of the web of the current invention is not to ensure minimal paper loss but to enable the on-demand printer to print wall paper to the customer's selected requirements. By slitting the web using the current invention, one portion of the web is now wasted. This limitation has now been included into claim 1. Further Kwasy et al does not disclose or suggest that the slitting of the web is performed in accordance with a width measurement as selected by the customer.

We respectfully submit that a person skilled in the art would not have combined Martin with Fujii et al as Fujii et al's complex system of determining for the customer the complex requirements of printing a wallpaper design is not suitable for the franchise on-demand printer of the current invention which requires simplicity for use. Further, the person skilled in the art would not have combined Kwasy with either Martin or Fujii et al as Kwasy teaches the minimisation of paper waste which is not the aim of the current invention.

Accordingly we respectfully submit that claim 1 having the new and inventive feature of capturing data regarding customer requirements including a selected width and enabling the franchisee to print a roll of wallpaper, onto a web of black media and to longitudinally slit the web so that one portion is the selected width and the second portion now wasted is now allowable.

Further, it is also submitted that Claims 3 to 51 being dependent on an inventive base claim, claim 1, are also inventive and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of those claims as lacking inventiveness over Martin in view of Fujii et al and Kwasy be withdrawn.

Appn No. 10/760,240
Amdt. Dated February 3, 2006
Response to Office Action of December 14, 2005

11


Applicant has fully responded to each matter of substance raised in the Office Action and believes that the case is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application is therefore courteously solicited. Should the Examiner have any requests, questions or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant at the number listed below.

Very respectfully,
Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

Applicant:



TOBIN ALLEN KING

Applicant:



JANETTE FAYE LEE

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762